



## Supplementary Planning Committee

**Wednesday 6 April 2016 at 7.00 pm**

Conference Hall - Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way,  
Wembley, HA9 0FJ

### Membership:

#### Members

Councillors:

Marquis (Chair)  
Agha (Vice-Chair)  
S Choudhary  
Colacicco  
Ezeajughi  
Mahmood  
Maurice  
M Patel

#### Substitute Members

Councillors:

Chohan, Hoda-Benn, Hylton, Khan and  
W Mitchell Murray

Councillors

Colwill and Kansagra

**For further information contact:** Joe Kwateng, Democratic Services Officer  
020 8937 1354; [joe.kwateng@brent.gov.uk](mailto:joe.kwateng@brent.gov.uk)

For electronic copies of minutes, reports and agendas, and to be alerted when the minutes of this meeting have been published visit:  
[democracy.brent.gov.uk](http://democracy.brent.gov.uk)

**The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting**

**Members' briefing will take place at 6.00pm in Boardrooms 7 and 8**

# Agenda

Introductions, if appropriate.

Apologies for absence and clarification of alternate members

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>WARD</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
2. Minutes of the previous meetings		1 - 16
3. Asda, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9EX (Ref. 16/0615)	Barnhill	17 - 18
4. Chesterfield House, 9 Park Lane, Wembley, HA9 7RH (Ref 15/4550)	Wembley Central	19 - 22
5. 76-78 Salusbury Road, London, NW6 6PA (Ref 15/4590)	Queens Park	23 - 24
7. 342 Neasden Lane, London, NW10 0AD (Ref 15/3398)	Dudden Hill	25 - 26



## LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

### MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Tuesday 26 January 2016 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Marquis (Chair), Agha (Vice-Chair), S Choudhary, Colacicco, Ezeajughi, Mahmood, Maurice and M Patel

#### 1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

None.

#### 2. **Review of SPG5 - Altering and Extending Your Home**

The current Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5 (SPG5) 'Altering and Extending Your Home' was adopted in 2002 and although it has served its purpose well, due to its age it requires updating. The report set out the areas proposed to be reviewed for the document to reflect practical experience of its use and to take into account changes in permitted development rights/prior approvals and increases in development activity including basements.

Paul Lewin (Planning Policy and Projects Manager) introduced the report. He drew members' attention to the changes to permitted development rights for residential extensions and ancillary buildings/structures and more recently the introduction of Prior Approvals. These potentially allowed development to occur which is inconsistent with some aspects of the SPG particularly distances anticipated between buildings and greater emphasis being placed on the quality of amenity to existing and future occupants. Members were also informed that particularly in the southern part of the Borough there has also been an increased demand for basement extensions which needed to be reflected in the SPG5. In respect of conservation area, he stated that some guidance existed in conservation area design guides however, a review of SPG 5 would also allow an opportunity to provide more up to date advice and a wider corporate response to issues outside direct planning control such as skip permits, parking bay suspensions and parking enforcement.

In the discussion that ensued, members welcomed the need for the review and unanimously recommended a separate SPG for basement developments due to the technical nature of developments. They also suggested that at the pre-application stage basement developments, applicants should be encouraged to cover issues such as the potential impacts on structural integrity and a flood risk assessment by a competent expert. Members also requested a clear section on Conservation Area policy and that officers should work with other departments of the Council on the control of public realm nuisances.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the need to review SPG 5 Altering and Extending Your Home be agreed;
- (ii) that SPG5 be issued for public consultation subject to the creation of a separate basement development policy which would also be referenced / linked from SPG5 as a stand alone document. Members felt that the basement development policy should also incorporate sections on basements in conservation areas, energy and efficiency requirements and non-technical summaries.

### **3. Review of SPG17 - Design Guide for New Developments**

The current SPG Design Guide for New Developments was adopted in 2001. The document has served its purpose well but due to its age requires updating. Since 2001 planning policy has changed significantly, particularly in relation to urban areas with much greater emphasis on maximising development density and the promotion of the efficient use of land particularly in areas of high public transport accessibility consistent with London Plan Policy 3.2: Optimising Housing Potential. The proposed review of the SPG17 document would also provides the opportunity for it to be a promotional tool, giving a positive message about development potential within Brent and the need for high quality design.

Paul Lewin (Planning Policy and Projects Manager) informed the Committee that the current SPG17, which primarily has a focus on the typical inter-war suburban context of Brent, was relevant in areas to much of the Borough where major change to the existing character was not envisaged.. However, there may be scope for greater flexibility for areas of larger transformational change, such as South Kilburn or Wembley where densities much higher than traditionally provided in Brent were anticipated. With reference to the report, he set out the steps towards achieving improved and successful developments in the borough.

Paul Lewin also clarified the approach to tall buildings adding that Brent's policy was in keeping with the London Plan. In working through the document members made various points on the following:

Incorporation of an overview of what makes a good development, e.g. sufficient infrastructure, landmark buildings.

Minimum standard to be maintained and flexibility provided where the applicant could show benefits/high amenity environment being created and softer approach to higher density, e.g. encouraging higher density development *where suitable*.

A greater emphasis on images with more soft landscaping/ spacing between buildings.

A reference to preventing/dealing with anti-social behaviour

Reference to the right tree in the right location.

More emphasis on energy efficiency of buildings.

In terms of understanding and promoting design improvements, Members indicated a need for plans and images for residential and commercial proposals of sufficient quality to be submitted to enable them to be more fully considered and to

reduce the risk of delay in decision making. Members were also keen to see a requirement for excellent design standards in all future developments especially on landmark sites. They also indicated a desire to develop existing opportunities to see proposals at an earlier stage in the planning application process, e.g. pre-application stage. They were also supportive of the proposal to retain an expert throughout the development construction to maintain high standards. Members suggested that wherever possible separate entrances for affordable housing units and owner occupiers should be avoided and that schemes should design out crime, particularly anti-social behaviour (ASBO). Members also queried the scope to amend the current general approach if densities and heights were significantly greater. In concluding on the item, the chair indicated that whilst it might not be appropriate to incorporate all changes to comments made, that officers should provide a response to members of the Committee as to how they had dealt with the points raised prior to consultation on the document.

Paul Lewin also clarified the approach to tall buildings adding that Brent's policy was in keeping with the London Plan. In working through the document members made various points which officers noted down. In terms of understanding and promoting design improvements, Members indicated a need for plans and images for residential and commercial proposals of sufficient quality to be submitted to enable them to be more fully considered and to reduce the risk of delay in decision making. They also indicated a desire to develop existing opportunities to see proposals at an earlier stage in the planning application process, e.g. pre-application stage. Members suggested that wherever possible separate entrances for affordable housing units and owner occupiers should be avoided and that schemes should design out crime, particularly anti-social behaviour (ASBO). Members also queried the scope to amend the current general approach if densities and heights were significantly greater. In concluding on the item, the chair indicated that whilst it might not be appropriate to incorporate all changes to comments made, that officers should provide a response to members of the Committee as to how they had dealt with the points raised prior to consultation on the document commencing.

RESOLVED:-

- (i) that the existing general approach within the guidance and the need to review and produce a new Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document to reflect its application within the Borough be supported;
- (ii) that subject to incorporation of feedback from members, a draft Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document be issued for public consultation.

#### **4. Planning Policy Work Programme 2016-2017**

The report from the Head of Planning set out potential projects for the coming year with indicative timescales of work. The report was intended to allow the Planning Committee to understand the context and to provide an input to forming Planning's work programme for areas covering the policy review and development function.

Members' input will feed into the wider service planning process and, in particular, the Peer Review process for Planning programmed for March 2016.

Stephen Weeks (Head of Planning) drew members' attention to the work programme for 2016/17, identifying the priority areas and those areas which were subject to confirmation, as set out in the report. He highlighted work associated with the adoption of the Development Management Policies Development Plan to replace all remaining policies in the 'saved' Unitary Development Plan and also the South Kilburn Masterplan.

Members queried the position on progressing the update to the local list and indicated support for the work to continue and be adopted as soon as possible. Members heard that as there were no objections to the pub protection policy the policy would be likely to be recommended for adoption with no major changes. Members also indicated that they would like to see the work in relation to the following policies prioritised – Local Development Plan, South Kilburn SPD, SPG5 and the separate basement development policy.

RESOLVED:-

that the areas of the work programme indicated for year 2016-17 service planning purposes as set out in the report from Head of Planning be agreed.

#### **5. Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

The meeting closed at 9.10 pm

COUNCILLOR S MARQUIS  
Chair



# LONDON BOROUGH OF BRENT

## MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE Wednesday 9 March 2016 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT: Councillors Marquis (Chair), S Choudhary, Colacicco, Ezeajughi, Khan, Mahmood, Maurice and M Patel

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors McLennan, Perrin and Warren

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Agha

### 1. **Declarations of personal and prejudicial interests**

Moberly Sports Centre, Kilburn Lane, London W10 4AH

The applicant sent by email, supporting documents to all members. Members also attended a presentation by the applicant in the presence of officers on 23 February 2016.

Byron Court Primary School, Spencer Road, Wembley HA0 3SF

Councillor Perrin sent emails to members and officers with detailed representations.

Barry Gardiner MP tried to call or called Councillors Choudhury, Colacicco, Ezeajughi and Mili Patel.

All members re-affirmed that they would consider all applications with an open mind.

### 2. **Minutes of the previous meeting - 10 February 2016**

RESOLVED:-

that the minutes of the previous meeting held on 10 February 2016 be approved as an accurate record of the meeting subject to amendments to item 8 (76-78 Salusbury Road, London NW6 6PA ref. 15/4590) relating to Judy Wilcox's address. Please see the minutes of that meeting for the full text. The text is also re-produced below:

"Judy Wilcox, speaking on behalf of the Hopefield Avenue residents raised concerns on the application on grounds of noise nuisance from staff and visitors to the pub and added that the previous owner had consistently failed to adhere to planning conditions including amplified music and hours of operation of the event rooms. She added that whilst some groups had moved to other sites, the use of the premises by other groups could worsen the problems being experienced by residents. She also reiterated residents' objection to the use of the entrance to the pub on the corner of Hopefield Avenue and Salusbury Road."

### 3. **Moberly Sports Centre, Kilburn Lane, North Kensington, London, W10 4AH (Ref.15/4226)**

PROPOSAL: Details pursuant to condition 17 (Construction Logistics Plan) relating to planning application reference 13/3682 dated 04/02/2015 for full planning permission sought for demolition of all existing buildings and erection of a part 7/part 6/part 5/part 4-storey building with 9293sqm of Sports and Leisure Centre (Use Class D2), 56 flats ( 22 x 1-bed, 34 x 2-bed) and 240sqm of retail floor space (Use Class A1/A2/A3) and erection of 15 terraced townhouses (15 x 4-bed) with associated car and cycle parking and landscaping and subject to a Deed of Agreement dated 02 February 2015 under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

Angus Saunders (Area Planning Manager) outlined the scheme which was considered at the last meeting at which members decided to refuse the application, contrary to officers' recommendation. With reference to the supplementary report, he informed the meeting that prior to the decision notice being issued, the applicants approached and made a presentation to the Committee on 23 February after which the Planning Committee agreed that the application with any amendments and further supporting information, could be reported back to the meeting on 9 March 2016. He then referred to amendments proposed by the applicants including servicing of large heavy goods vehicles (HGV's) from either Banister Road or Kilburn Lane.

The Area Planning Manager advised the committee that in order to reduce traffic impact, the applicants were now proposing to further reduce the hours that the service bay would be in operation as detailed in the supplementary report. This measure would avoid school peak hours and thus limit potential congestion and pollution caused by standing traffic. Furthermore, in order to minimise impact on local shops, the applicants had offered access to the proposed servicing bay when not in use for HGV deliveries on an organised basis and would involve marshalled access controlled by the contractor's staff. He continued that the Head of Transportation had agreed with the applicant's assessment of potential congestion and the advantage of reducing the HGV servicing hours.

Members heard that the applicants had also met with local residents associations and had subsequently provided further information. As a result, all the local residents associations who had originally objected to the proposal (APRATA, KRRRA and KTRA) accepted Chamberlayne Road as the location for an off site loading bay and thus no longer objected to this element. He drew members' attention to additional responses submitted to other concerns expressed by Residents' Associations as set out in the supplementary report.

John Keutgen speaking on behalf of the Residents' Associations confirmed that they had met with the applicants and were satisfied that the additional extensive information received would mitigate concerns expressed previously.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to conditions as recommended - (7 in support; 1 abstention).

**4. Land at the Junction of Brondesbury Park & Christchurch Avenue  
Christchurch Avenue, London (Ref.16/0169)**

PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing single storey nursery building and erection of a part three part four storey building to provide educational accommodation for use by Marylebone Boys' School for a temporary period of 2 years until September 2018, with associated works to include fenced multi-games area (MUGA), car and cycle parking spaces, creation of vehicular and pedestrian access, boundary alterations and hard and soft landscaping.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the Draft Decision Notice and additional conditions on bus capacity and windows.

Angus Saunders (Area Planning Manager) outlined the scheme and with reference to the supplementary report responded to issues raised at the site visit. In respect of the relationship between the proposed school and Marada House, he recommended imposition of a condition to secure an undertaking from the applicant that the windows would be obscure glazed. He added that the temporary structure proposed would not have a materially harmful impact on the outlook of neighbouring residents. He then referred to the list of objections set out in the supplementary report adding that the issues raised had been addressed in the main report. The Area Planning Manager advised members that Transport for London (TfL) were yet to confirm whether there was likely to be an impact on the capacity of bus routes serving the school. In the absence of the confirmation, he recommended a further condition to address this as set out in the supplementary report.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Warren (ward member) stated that he was addressing the Committee in place of Councillor Shaw but he had not been approached. Councillor Warren stated that although he was not against the principle of the development, he raised the following three issues of concerns:

- a) Flawed Travel Plan.
- b) The proposed four storey building would be out of character with the properties in the area and represented an overdevelopment of the site.
- c) Noise nuisance from the pupils would result in a detrimental impact on the quality of life of the residents in the area.
- d) Impact on the local highways network and public transport in an area with a moderate PTAL rating.

Kieron Porter (applicant's architect) in responding to the issues raised by the ward member stated that adequate measures including a Travel Plan would be put in place to ensure that the development would not result in parking problems whilst a separate vehicle access would address road safety concerns. He added that the massing and design of the proposed development accorded with guidelines and standards and ensured it was not out of character. The applicant's architect continued that the provision of outside playing space coupled with planting in and around the site would minimise any potential noise from pupils.

In response to members' questions, the applicant's architect stated that any potential pollution via the heating and cooling system would be addressed by natural ventilation measures. Although he did not have the figures for Brent residents who would be attending the school, he stated that most of the pupils would be drawn from the local area and other pupils who lived outside of the area would be encouraged to use public transport including the tube stations nearby. Tony Kennedy (Head of Transportation) stated that from highways perspective, there would be no detrimental impact on the surrounding roads.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to conditions as recommended - (7 in support; 1 abstention).

**5. College of North West London, Priory Park Road, London, NW6 7UJ (Ref.15/0406)**

PROPOSAL: Retention of a 2.4 m high fence with associated doors to the building

Members noted from the supplementary report that the strip of land, queried at the site visit, was in the ownership of Brent Housing Partnership (BHP).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to conditions as recommended (Unanimous).

**6. Land East of Victoria Centre, Acton Lane, London (Ref.15/4496)**

PROPOSAL: Outline planning permission for erection six storey building comprising 103 self-contained one bed apartments as supported housing units (Use Class C2) with associated community facilities.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to conditions as recommended (Unanimous).

**7. Community Centre, Crystal House, 2 Agate Close, London, NW10 7FJ (Ref.15/4559)**

PROPOSAL: Variation of condition 23 (to allow the change of use of the ground floor from a doctor's surgery into a day nursery Use class D1) of full planning permission reference 04/0401 dated 26/04/2005 for Demolition of Guinness Sports and Social Club building and 2 squash courts and redevelopment of land to West of Abbeyfields Close and to rear (South) of Abbeyfields Close and Moyne Place to provide a total of 192 residential units (80 affordable) and community facility, doctors' surgery and childcare facility.

RECOMMENDATION Grant planning permission subject to conditions as set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

John Haston (Vice Chair of West Twyford Residents' Association) and Councillor Joy Morrissey of London Borough of Ealing in addressing the Committee emphasised the need for a new GP surgery in the locality, to cope with new residential units being built in the locality. John Haston added that the local community had many elderly and infirm persons who would find it difficult to travel further to other GP surgeries.

Officers advised that discussion with the local Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) was undertaken as part of the application. The CCG maintained that as the existing GP/medical space did not meet the requirements of their new strategy for provision of primary healthcare, the space would become a children's nursery.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to conditions as recommended (Unanimous).

**8. 280 Ealing Road, Wembley, HA0 4LL (Ref. 15/5425)**

PROPOSAL: Removal of existing and installation of 2No. A/C condensers and 2No. Refrigeration condensers to the rear elevation of the shop and installation of louvre to existing flank wall (as amended).

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions as set out in the Draft Decision Notice

DECISION

Granted planning permission subject to conditions as recommended (unanimous).

**9. Yellow Car Park, Fulton Road, Wembley (Ref.15/5394)**

PROPOSAL: Reserved matters application in relation to outline planning permission 14/3054. This application relates to Plots NW07 and NW08 for the construction of two buildings with two cores each ranging from 2 to 17 storeys in height, providing 361 residential units (within private, intermediate and affordable rented tenures), with private communal residential landscaped gardens, 59 car parking spaces for residential use, and 3,578 sqm (GEA) of commercial space for either Class A1 or A2 (Retail), A3 (Café and Restaurant), A4 (Drinking establishments), A5 (Hot food takeaway), B1 (Business) and/or D2 (Leisure and Entertainment), ancillary space, and associated plant, cycle storage for 584 bicycles, refuse provision and associated infrastructure including the creation of " West Olympic Way" . The application has been submitted pursuant to conditions 1 (Layout, Scale, Appearance, Access and Landscaping); 8(c) Layout details; 8 (8(d) Highways layout; 8(e) Cycle storage; 8(f) Parking; 8(h) Access; 8(i) Daylight; 8(k) Wind); 9 (Noise); 12 (Noise); 20 (Vehicular access); 23 (Sustainability Implementation Strategy); 26 (Surface water drainage); 28 (Affordable Housing Storage). This application also provides information pursuant to the S106 obligations with regard

to Plots NW07 and NW08: 4: Affordable Housing, 10.5 Demolition, 12 Sport and Play Space, 19 Brent Access Forum.

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the Reserved Matters subject to conditions set out in the decision notice and approve details pursuant to conditions 1, 8d, e, f, h, i, k, 9, 12, 20, 23, 26 and 28 in relation to plot NW07 and NW08, subject to the conditions as set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) outlined the scheme and in referencing the supplementary report, clarified the issues raised at the site visit including the relationship between the proposed building and Olympic Way, concerns raised regarding Use Class A4 premises fronting on to the new street and community based use.

Anne Clements (applicant) stated that the design and appearance of the proposed buildings continued with the design approach and quality of design adopted for the two previous buildings granted planning permission within the North West Lands. She continued that the layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping were considered to be acceptable and in line with the parameters set out in the outline consent and Design Specification for North West Lands. Details provided relating to the layout, highways layout, cycle storage, parking, access, daylight and wind would provide appropriate standards for future residents as well as have an acceptable impact on and relationship with the wider locality. Anne Clements added that in addition to the financial contributions secured under the Section 106 legal agreement, the proposal would provide affordable housing units and 27 car club car units.

DECISION: Approved reserved matters subject to conditions as recommended - (unanimous).

**10. Byron Court Primary School, Spencer Road, Wembley, HA0 3SF (Ref.15/4523)**

PROPOSAL: Demolition of eight existing buildings on site comprising 4x teaching blocks, 1x shelter, 1x shed, 1x storage/garage and 1x kitchen and dining facilities and construction of new part single and part two storey building (to accommodate expansion of the school from 3 form to 5 form entry primary school), all-weather MUGA to include the reconfiguration of the School's playing field and associated landscaping and parking, upgrading of the Nathans Road access and temporary permission for the erection of a single teaching block (2x classrooms) for use until July 2017.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) outlined the scheme and referenced the supplementary report which contained officers' responses to issues raised at the site visit. In terms of visibility in Nathans Road, he reported that in addition to the speed cushions on either side of the crossover, Transportation had also requested a speed table outside the entrance which would extend to the adjoining properties

and the opposite driveways and would further help manage the speed outside the school entrance. He continued that tracking diagrams provided in the Construction Management Plan demonstrated that access can be achieved from Nathans Road by tipper trucks, cement mixers and mobile cranes.

Members were advised that the proposed hours for community access to the MUGA would be comparable to other schools within the borough and therefore the level of use envisaged was not expected to result in significant levels of traffic or disturbance to local residents. In respect of the Travel Plan, he continued that Officers in Transportation had advised that the Travel Plan generally met with standards and that more emphasis on the park and stride option, centred around Northwick Park, with more ambitious targets was required. The applicant had also advised that the use of shuttle school buses from a "park & ride" location was looked at but was not considered a suitable measure for a primary school, given the local catchment which provided suitable opportunities for walking and cycling / scooting. Instead, park & stride measures were considered more suitable to reduce existing traffic impact, as proposed at Northwick Park car park, as well as walking bus proposals.

David Glover then referred to a submission by Councillor Perrin and members of Sudbury Court Residents' Association (SCRA) regarding signatories to the objections and clarified that the reference to it as a petition did not diminish the weight given to the objections or the fact that a very large number of people were objecting to the proposals. He also referred to a suggestion by Barry Gardiner MP for a site visit during weekday which would provide a proper reflection of the traffic impact and submitted that the Council's Highways service visited the site on multiple instances to observe the traffic conditions and had provided information regarding this. The observations were taken into account when providing their views on the proposal.

Suzanne D'Souza speaking on behalf of SCRA stated that the proposed expansion of the school from 3 form entry (3FE) to 5 form entry (5FE) constituted an over-development of the site. She continued that the school's Travel Plan and the traffic assessment were inadequate to address the level of traffic and parking which would be unacceptably high in the surrounding area, giving rise to health and safety issues. She added that this point had been confirmed by officers who had major concerns for pupil safety. Despite the school having a silver rated Travel Plan, even on the existing 3FE the traffic problems around the school were still unresolved. There had been failed attempts by the school, the Safer Neighbourhood Team, the local councillors and the Council to resolve the problems. She therefore stated that the revised Travel Plan would be inadequate to deal with the increase in pupil numbers, most of whom would come from outside the catchment area. With regards to the park & stride proposal, she highlighted the fact that the Transportation officers stated that this was essential to deal with the traffic problems from such an expansion but the school had admitted the trialled take up had been poor. Finally she added that as the Council had not notified about 1,500 residents who signed the SCRA objection letter about the committee meeting or site visit, the proposed expansion should not proceed.

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Code of Practice, Councillor Perrin (ward member) stated that he had been approached by the residents. Councillor Perrin informed the Committee that 1,500 residents who objected to the proposed expansion of the school were not notified of the committee meeting or site visit and therefore had been denied the opportunity to respond. He added that the school was unable to enforce the existing Travel Plan and the revised Travel Plan was inadequate as it relied on park & stride, which was impractical. His analysis of the potential use of the car park showed at least 200 cars during the existing school run. An extra 299 car journeys would be generated by the expansion according to the report. This would require 324 cars entering and exiting a single carriageway in 30 minutes, the equivalent of a car every 5 seconds. Due to other logistical issues with the use of the car park, such as cars arriving at the same time, numbers of staff required to collect 160 children, whether parents would drive past the school to use the car park etc. he stated the park & stride would not address the traffic problems generated by the expansion.

He also stated that historically police and parking enforcement had failed to deal with the current traffic problems which are exacerbated by commuter parking and an increase in Northwick Park Hospital staff using the roads. He stated that parking enforcement was lacking and was imperative to any potential solution. Councillor Perrin continued that the report by the Council's Highways officers was inadequate in several respects to support the application, especially its reliance on the park & stride scheme and urged members to refuse the application.

Cllr Perrin queried whether the committee had considered the detailed representations he had submitted prior to the meeting. Mr Weeks confirmed members and officers had received the representations but due to lack of time before the meeting they had not had an opportunity to consider them in full.

Martin Clark (Executive Headteacher) and John Grantham (applicant's agent) addressed the Committee. The Executive Headteacher summarised the rationale for the expansion of the school from 3FE to 5FE adding that concerns about traffic and parking would be addressed through a relentless Travel Plan to support the application. The agent added that the demonstrable need for the expansion had been established by the Council's Capital Programme officers who were on hand to offer further information to the Committee. He stated that there were no material planning reasons for refusal as the siting and layout of new school buildings within the school site complied with SPG17 guidance and would not adversely impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Cheryl Andani (Capital Programme Manager) informed members that a report about the increase in school places to meet the growing deficit in the borough had been agreed by the Cabinet. She added that the resulting surplus at Byron Court school would be filled with children from other planning areas: (PA1 – Queensbury, Fryent and Welsh Harp and PA3 – Wembley, Sudbury and Tokyngton), which would increase the number of children travelling in cars. She confirmed that there would be a 2FE surplus in planning area 2 if the expansion was approved. In relation to the Council meeting its duty to provide a reasonable offer to children from these other planning areas – a place within 2 miles of home for 5-8 year olds – she could not say whether these areas would meet the distance requirement.

Members then raised questions about the school's Travel Plan and generally about the traffic impact of the proposed application including the feasibility of an off-site park and ride scheme, which would reduce the number of cars entering the roads adjoining the school. In response to members' questions, the applicant's agent stated that through a mix of encouragement to parents to engage in responsible parking and staggered parking, the Travel Plan would adequately address the traffic impact of the application. He added that park and ride was considered but was not found to be practical. Instead the focus would be on a scheme for a car share and park and stride.

Tony Kennedy (Head of Transportation) attended the meeting to respond to queries on highways' issues presented by the application. He stated that officers were aware of the current congestion problems around the school during drop off and pick up and to address that, Highways officers had recommended that additional measures be secured to mitigate the potential increase in traffic and parking on the roads, including improvements to the Travel Plan and Highways improvements. These would include junction improvements around Nathans Road, raised tables, weight and waiting restrictions, traffic enforcement officers and proposed park and stride measures for the Northwick Car Park. He advised members that the Travel Plan which would incorporate better targets, taking into consideration the increase in staff, would be challenging, monitored and checked annually to ensure its effectiveness. Mr Kennedy talked the members through the road plans showing the proposed highways improvements as this information had only been made available to the members immediately prior to the meeting.

DECISION: Granted planning permission subject to conditions as recommended and additional conditions for a work buffer of 5m to be implemented beyond the roots zone of the trees in the location; the gate be set back 10m from the school on Nathans Road; and amendment to condition 27 to specify applicable hours in the car management plan - (4 in support; 3 against; 1 abstention).

#### **11. Uxendon Manor Primary School, Vista Way, Harrow, HA3 0UX (Ref.15/5240)**

PROPOSAL: Expansion of current 2FE to 4FE primary school with associated landscape works and including:

1. Demolition of two classroom blocks, sports hall, toilet wing and staff room.
2. Construction of new 2 storey block providing 16 classrooms and associated spaces linking to existing building, new single storey providing 4 classrooms and associated spaces in SE corner of the site and a new larger sports hall.
3. Internal alterations and remodelling to main school building providing enlarged reception and main entrance, converting existing reception classrooms into new music/dance studio space and upgrading and remodelling of the existing kitchen and dining hall.
4. New incoming electrical connection
5. Provision of temporary classrooms and toilets for the duration of the works, including creation of services connections

RECOMMENDATION: Grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

David Glover (Area Planning Manager) introduced the scheme and with reference to the supplementary report, responded to queries raised during the site visit. He reported that grey-water use was discounted because of the relatively low water volume used in the kitchen and sinks and the capital cost and use of the area for storage/treatment/pump plant. He added that the storage of rain water could also eventually overflow to attenuation tanks which was already providing sustainable drainage. He continued that officers in Transportation had also advised that a number of parking restrictions were being considered within the area which would include the introduction of a 3hr restriction along Woodcock Hill. David Glover also drew members' attention to the relevant paragraphs in the main report that addressed the highways concerns expressed by some residents.

John Poole (local resident) objected to the proposed development on the grounds that the local area was already experiencing serious problems with flooding and road drainage. He circulated pictures showing the flooding of the school playing fields. He added that the sewer system which was currently working to full capacity with overspills from Shaftesbury Avenue would not be able to cope with the school expansion.

David Rubin (local resident) raised concerns on highways issues and the impact of the proposal on local traffic congestion. He added that the use of the school hall outside of school normal hours would lead to noise nuisance as well as raise health and safety issues. He also raised security concerns about the nearby synagogue.

Lucy Read (applicant's architect) stated that the proposed works would not disturb the existing building and therefore the attenuation tanks would have no impact on the sewerage in the area. She reported on her meeting with Thames Water which supported her view and added that the proposal complied with design standards. In response to members' questions, the applicant's agent stated that the sustainability strategy of the proposal achieved BREEAM standards.

DECISION: Granted planning permission as recommended and an informative regarding the need for additional parking enforcement to be undertaken by the Council after completion - (7 in support; 1 against).

## **12. Any Other Urgent Business**

None.

The meeting closed at 10.48 pm

S MARQUIS  
Chair

Note: At 10:00pm the Committee voted to disapply the guillotine procedure so as to be able to consider all applications on the night.

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Agenda Item 03

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 6 April, 2016

Case No. 16/0615

---

Location	Asda, Forty Lane, Wembley, HA9 9EX
Description	Details pursuant to condition 4 (monitoring and acoustic investigation) of variation of condition application ref 03/1003 relating to planning permission ref 98/0413, dated 03/07/98, for the construction of a retail superstore with provision of service yard and customer car-parking to read as follows: "The store shall not be serviced on Sundays and Bank Holidays by more than six service vehicles on any one day without the consent in writing of the Local Planning Authority"

#### Agenda Page Number: 5

Further comments on the application have since been received. Both comments were received from residents of 115 Chalkhill Road on the 29th March 2016.

Both comments made reference to the fact that noise pollution improved for a short period of time while the monitoring was being undertaken, but that the noise was still ongoing.

The first comment identified a number of times during the week of 19th March to 25th March when disruptive noise and vibrations were experienced as a result of delivery activity. These instances included:

- Banging and crashing of crates (19th March at 6:15am and 6:40am, 21st March from 6:50am to 7:09am and 25th March at 6:38am)
- Vehicle Reversing (20th March at 10:05pm and 21st March at 9:54pm)
- Seagulls squawking (21st March at 5:44am)
- Gate being dragged across tarmac (21st March at 9:54pm)

It notes that these noises are particularly disruptive, either causing the residents to wake up or to struggle to get to sleep and are having a negative impact on the health of residents. This is in stark contrast to previous times, where seagulls were the only disturbance on a seasonal basis. The resident notes that they now experiences disturbance from seagulls, delivery vans and ASDA staff all year round.

The second comment agrees with the first and specifies that ASDA van delivery workers start banging and crashing crates just after 6am every week day, and in some instances before 6 am and during weekends. They consider that there is no management input or employee education on the part of ASDA that encourages undisruptive loading and unloading of crates.

It would appear that the "Delivery Management Plan" was only adhered to during the monitoring period and it is unfortunate that it has since not been adhered to. This matter has been taken up with Asda by the Planning Enforcement Team. Residents comments would suggest that the noise level experienced during the monitoring period was acceptable, in-line with the findings of the acoustic monitoring report.

Officers continue to recommend that the submitted details are approved as the applicant has shown that the measures set out in the "Delivery Management Plan" can reduce noise to an acceptable level. However, this highlights the importance of the condition that has been recommended which prevents servicing from taking place outside of the standard hours if Asda do not implement the "Delivery Management Plan" measures.

**Recommendation: Remains approval subject to the condition set out within the Committee Report.**

DocSuppF

*Document Imaged*

*DocSuppF*

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Agenda Item 04

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 6 April, 2016

Case No. 15/4550

---

Location	Chesterfield House, 9 Park Lane, Wembley, HA9 7RH
Description	Proposed demolition of existing building and erection of 21 and 26 storey building comprising flexible retail/commercial (Use Classes A1-A4) and community uses (Use Class D1) at ground floor and basement level, 239 residential units (Use Class C3) on the upper floors and associated landscaping, public realm, ancillary servicing and plant, car and cycle parking and associated works

#### Agenda Page Number: 17 - 66

Members visited the site on 2 April 2016. Members have sought clarification on issues relating to the community centre, servicing, parking and highways, social infrastructure and drainage.

#### Community centre

The applicant clarified that the proposed community centre would be gifted to an appropriate community organisation. Members sought clarification if this could be used to provide facilities such as a Doctors' surgery and the applicant has confirmed it could.

#### Servicing

In terms of servicing arrangements, it is proposed to utilise the following:

- Existing loading/servicing bays on the site side of High Road (space for 3 transit vans)
- The northern (site) side of Park Lane within the P+D bays (space for 4/5 transit vans)
- The proposed site access and internal service area (space for large vehicles).

It is proposed that short stay loading is to take place from the surrounding loading facilities on the highway network. Any long stay vehicle, such as removals/long term maintenance vehicles can enter the site and remain within the internal service area.

On initial move-ins it is proposed to utilise the bin store space for removal trucks and deliveries, as the bins would not be all needed early in the development. Move-ins, deliveries and workmen would be coordinated by the concierge to ensure that there wasn't undue stress on the network.

Given the large amount of office and retail floorspace on the existing site, the proposed development is anticipated to reduce the overall number of servicing vehicles visiting the site. This should therefore ease capacity within the local areas.

#### Car park and parking impact

The actual area where parking spaces are located is in third party ownership, the applicant is currently in discussion with the owner about acquiring that ownership. Ownership of the land for parking would come complete with full and unencumbered rights of access over the access road. Condition 3 requires the parking spaces to be provided prior to occupation of the proposed development and thereafter used ancillary to the development.

The nearest street to the application site that is located outside the year-round CPZ is Hillside Avenue, which is a 550m (7 minute) walk to the north. It should be noted that this is still within the Wembley Stadium event day CPZ and the nearest street that is outside the Wembley Stadium CPZ is Peel Road, about a one mile walk north of the site. Transportation officers consider that few residents that don't have access to the spaces within the site would seek to own a car when the nearest on-street parking is so distant. It is therefore considered unlikely that the development would have any impact in those areas.

With all of the Wembley Masterplan development in the area, there is also a reasonable chance that year-round CPZ's will be extended into those streets nearest the site, pushing available on-street parking yet

*Document Imaged*

*DocSuppF*  
*Ref: 15/4550 Page 1 of 3*

further from the site.

## **Highways impact**

Paragraphs 147 – 155 of the officers report address this particular point, with the conclusions being: (i) with the significant reduction in parking for the site, the development will generate much less vehicular traffic to and from the site; (ii) the development is likely to have an impact on bus journeys and TfL have requested a contribution towards dealing with this; and (iii) the proposed improvements to the footway along the site frontage and CIL funding towards findings from the Wembley High Road corridor study will help to mitigate any increase in footfall to and from the site.

It should be noted that TfL is seeking a contribution towards the cost of splitting bus route 83 and introducing a new route. This is well known by Brent (transport) officers who have been working with TfL to identify improvements for Wembley Growth Area's public transport service. TfL will be consulting publicly on this later this year. TfL have confirmed that they are seeking a £310,000 contribution towards these improvements to local bus services.

## **Social infrastructure**

Three existing GP surgeries exist within 1km of the site, situated between the application site and the A406 North Circular Road to the south. A further two GP surgeries exist within 1km to the west of the site. There is also a dental surgery located on the High Road to the west of the site.

With the population growth envisaged it is important that supporting social infrastructure such as schools, health centres and community facilities are adequately planned for. The Infrastructure and Investment Framework 2011 (IIF), prepared by the Council supports the policies and proposals in the Local Development Framework (LDF), and provides the evidence base for identified specific infrastructure needs, including social infrastructure for Wembley. This is predicated on the planned housing growth of at least 11, 500 new homes in Wembley between 2010 and 2026.

Anticipated infrastructure is expected to include new schools, extensions to existing local schools, nursery places, at least 2.4ha of new public open space, improvements to the quality and accessibility of existing open space, a new community swimming pool, new health facilities (for GP's and dentists) and new multi-use community facilities. This is set out in Core Strategy policy WEM29.

School infrastructure needs are identified in the Brent School Place Planning Strategy. In terms of schools near to the application site the Council has identified the expansion of Elsley Primary School by two new forms of entry (to four forms of entry) and Oakington Manor Primary on one new form of entry (to four forms of entry). Ark Elvin Academy has been granted planning permission for a new secondary school of 1750 pupils in nine forms of entry.

To meet the identified infrastructure needs funding is expected largely to come from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). This scheme will secure a CIL contribution of approximately £5.4 million.

## **Drainage**

Thames Water have not raised concern regarding capacity but have sought clarification from the developer that there is sufficient capacity available for the development. Additionally, Condition 8 and Informative 4 have been imposed to ensure that the development is acceptable in terms of drainage and that works are carried out to the satisfaction of Thames Water.

It should also be noted that Condition 21 relates to Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems which will help to deal with the impacts of the proposal in terms of drainage.

## **Additional representations**

Since the committee report was written, further representations have been received by the planning department. These include an additional letter of support (submitted by Cultural Health and Science Initiatives Enterprise.org) taking the total number of letters of support to seven.

Three additional objections have been received, raising the following concerns:

1. The proposed development is far too high in relation to other adjacent buildings, this height is not only

imposing but will block light and affect privacy for many neighbouring properties. The density is also a concern for this locality

2. Park Lane is already log jammed by traffic during peak times and no consideration has been given to the obvious added volume of traffic and local infrastructure caused by the huge number of flats in the proposed development

3. The proposed parking for the new development is 13 disabled spaces, this will mean that tenants with cars will park in the already oversubscribed adjacent roads

4. Concern at the extent and process of consultation on this application.

The points raised in these emails have previously been addressed within the 'consultations' section of the case officers report.

### **Other issues**

Since the committee report was written and the draft decision notice prepared, officers would like to add an additional condition to the decision notice which is outlined below.

#### **Condition 25**

Notwithstanding the details referred to in the submitted application, details of the proposed canopies, colonnade, shopfronts, and ground floor elevations along Wembley High Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any above ground construction work is commenced (save for demolition). The work shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development which does not prejudice the amenity of the locality.

### **Recommendation**

Remains approval, subject to the additional condition above and those set out in the draft decision notice.

DocSuppF

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Agenda Item 05

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 6 April, 2016

Case No. 15/4590

---

Location	76-78 Salusbury Road, London, NW6 6PA
Description	Change of use of the 1st, 2nd and part of the ground floor of the public house (Use class A4) to create 8 self-contained flats ( 3 x 1bed, 3 x 2bed and 2 x 3bed) together with associated alterations to include removal of rear dormer window, new 2nd floor rear extension, stairwell extension, replacement and relocation of some of the windows, insertion of new windows and rooflights, terraces and screening, cycle parking spaces and bin stores

#### Agenda Page Number:

Some additional representations have been received:

#### 1. Representations

1.1 Some residents of Hopefield Avenue reiterate their history of issues at the address and have included minutes of a meeting between Brent Council Licensing Team, Met Police, Environmental Health Enforcement and the operator. The historic issues of the Corrib Rest were discussed at the February Committee and Members are aware of the material planning considerations around this issue.

1.2 Your Officers have been sent copies of representations made by local residents to the local MP- Tulip Siddiq. These representations cite:

- Loss of the space on the upper floors will result in a loss of community space forever;
- The Corrib has functioned as a vibrant hub for community use over many years;
- Loss of community rooms for local groups such as Swing Patrol;
- A reminder that building was bought with public money by the GLC to establish an Irish Cultural and Community Centre in Brent

1.3 QPARA have submitted further representations to Officers. The updated objection cites;

- How the Pub and the Community/Function rooms operated together as community resources
- Disabled and child friendly access will be limited and some members of the community excluded by use
- Issues regarding the protection of Hopefield Avenue residents
- Inadequate Community space provided
- Financial contribution not great enough to offset the loss

1.4 A local resident has also made suggestions of where, if the application is approved, any contributions could be spent:

- The library often closes early and there is scope to spend money improving this resource
- There is a vacant police station which is considered to be social infrastructure and approaches could be made to the Met Police or the current owners of the property to bring it back into some kind of use.

1.5 Your officers should note that expenditure of S106 funds is subject to the terms of the legal agreement and legislation including the CIL Regulations.

#### Recommendation: Remains refusal

DocSuppF

**This page is intentionally left blank**

## Agenda Item 07

### Supplementary Information Planning Committee on 6 April, 2016

Case No. 15/3398

---

Location	342 Neasden Lane, London, NW10 0AD
Description	Temporary permission for the part change of use of existing retail shop (Use class A1) to provide a radio controlled mini-cab office (Use class Sui Generis)

#### Agenda Page Number:

Members visited the site on 02/04/2016. There were issues raised in relation to:

- 1) Enforcement of the restrictions on the operation of the business, including office layout
- 2) Parking restrictions of the roads in the surrounding area.

In addition two local residents attended the site visit and a petition was handed over objecting to the the proposals citing "noise disturbances, parking issues and will adversely affect the local residents and visitors". These aspects are covered within the main body of the report.

#### 1) Enforcement

1.1 Your Officers recognise the concerns of Members with regards to enforcing the 'radio controlled' aspect of the proposal. However, with the initial temporary consent and conditions to restrict pick ups/drop offs, signage and waiting room, it is possible for Officers to monitor any complaints from local residents and act upon any breaches.

1.2 Members raised the point regarding the layout of the Mini Cab Office and how the window and location of the door can promote its use by passing customers. Your Officers have requested to the applicant that the window is removed in the proposed plans and the rear of the property is converted into a 'Staff Only' area; however the Applicant has declined to revise this part of the scheme and intends to explain hi sreasoning to Members during the Planning Committee meeting.

#### 2) Parking restrictions

3.1 Members have requested that a diagram of parking restrictions on surrounding streets is drawn up so members can properly assess the immediate area. Your Transportation Officers have been requested to produce this map and it will be available to view at Committee.

#### Recommendation: Remains approval

DocSuppF

**This page is intentionally left blank**